



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/715,425

11/19/2003

Jerome Cornet

ALC 3097

5332

7590 06/12/2008
KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.
Suite 240
1725 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

EXAMINER

BIAGINI, CHRISTOPHER D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2142

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

06/12/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/715,425	Applicant(s) CORNET ET AL.	
	Examiner Christopher Biagini	Art Unit 2142	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Christopher Biagini. (3) Scott Pojunas.

(2) Andrew Caldwell. (4) Patrick Wamsley.

Date of Interview: 06 June 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-8.

Identification of prior art discussed: Abjanic, Horvitz.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Discussed proposed amendments with respect to Abjanic and Horvitz references. Also discussed the teachings of the references. With respect to claim 5, discussed whether the "capable of" language was limiting. Discussed whether apparatus claims were statutory under 35 USC 101. The Examiner suggested including in any response to the Final Office Action a discussion of whether the claimed "routing instruction processor" was limited to hardware or if it included hardware and/or software embodiments..

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Andrew Caldwell/ Supervisory Patent Examiner
Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

PTOL-413A (10-07)
Approved for use through 05/31/2008. OMB 0551-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Applicant Initiated Interview Request Form

Application No.: 10/715,425 First Named Applicant: Jerome Cornet
Examiner: C. Biagini Art Unit: 2142 Status of Application: Pending

Tentative Participants:

(1) Terry W. Kramer (41,541) (2) Scott Pejunos
(3) Chris Biagini (4) _____

Proposed Date of Interview: June 6, 2008 Proposed Time: 2:00 AM ☒ PM

Type of Interview Requested:

(1) ☐ Telephonic (2) ☒ Personal (3) ☐ Video Conference

Exhibit To Be Shown or Demonstrated:

☐ YES ☒ NO

If yes, provide brief description: _____

Issues To Be Discussed

Issues (Rej., Obj., etc)	Claims/ Fig. #s	Prior Art	Discussed	Agreed	Not Agreed
(1) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(2) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(3) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
(4) _____	_____	_____	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

☐ Continuation Sheet Attached

Brief Description of Argument to be Presented:

Discuss proposed amendment in response to all issues raised in
Office Action dated March 27, 2008. Proposed amendment will
be sent prior to interview.

An interview was conducted on the above-identified application on _____.

NOTE: This form should be completed by applicant and submitted to the examiner in advance of the interview (see MPEP § 713.01).

This application will not be delayed from issue because of applicant's failure to submit a written record of this interview. Therefore, applicant is advised to file a statement of the substance of this interview (37 CFR 1.133(b)) as soon as possible.

Terry W. Kramer
Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature

Terry W. Kramer
Typed/Printed Name of Applicant or Representative

41,541

Registration Number, if applicable

Examiner/SPE Signature

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.133. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to take 21 minutes to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.

JUN-03-2008 09:35

KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.

703 5199802 P.01



KRAMER | AMADO^{PC}
PATENT RESEARCH SERVICES
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW

1725 DUKE STREET, SUITE 240 TEL 703.519.9801
ALEXANDRIA, VIRGINIA 22314 FAX 703.519.9802

KramerAmado.com

Examiner Biagini,

Per our conversation last week, please find a proposed amendment regarding Application No. 10/715,425. At the interview on Friday, we will be prepared to discuss an overview of the invention, and address the objections and rejections in view of our proposed amendment. We would like to reach an agreement regarding each of the objections and rejections, if possible. Feel free to call at (703) 519-9803 if you will require any additional information.

Sincerely,
Scott Pojunas

Application No: 10/715,425
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3097

CLAIM AMENDMENTS

This listing of claims will replace all prior versions and listings of claims in the application.

Listing of Claims

1. (Currently Amended) A content switch managed by a network provider for use in routing packets to application providers in a computer based communications system comprising:
 - a parser for parsing a schema document associated with a packet and containing routing rules;
 - a routing instruction processor to interpret the routing rules in the schema document, the routing instruction processor connected to a top side of the parser; and
 - an HTTP analysis layer connected to a bottom side of the parser, the bottom side being opposite the top side,

wherein each application provider directly manages the routing rules.
2. (Original) The content switch as defined in claim 1 for parsing XML-based language.
3. (Currently Amended) A method of carrying out content switching for application providers in a network provider of a computer-based communications system comprising:
 - determining a routing action to be taken on packets of a flow associated with a document written according to a schema wherein the determination is made by applying routing rules contained in the schema to elements parsed from the document, and

JUN-03-2008 09:36

KRAMER & AMADO, P.C.

703 5199802 P.03

Application No: 10/715,425
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3097

routing the packets according to the determined routing action,

wherein determining the routing action is performed by a routing instruction processor,

the elements are parsed from the document by a parser, ~~and the parser is connected between the~~
routing instruction processor and an HTTP analysis layer, and each application provider directly
manages the routing rules.

4. (Original) The method as defined in claim 3 wherein an XML based language is used.

5. (Currently Amended) A system for use in routing traffic to application providers in a
network provider of a computer based communications network comprising:

a content switch having a routing instruction processor capable of interpreting routing
rules in a document written according to a schema associated with a packet and applying the
rules to elements in the network, the rules being parsed from the document by a parser, and
means to determine a routing action to be performed on packets from a packet flow associated
with the document,

wherein the parser is connected between the routing instruction processor and an HTTP
analysis layer and each application provider directly manages the routing rules.

6. (Original) The system as defined in claim 5 for parsing XML-based languages.

7. (Currently Amended) A computer program schema stored on a computer-readable

Application No: 10/715,425
Attorney's Docket No: ALC 3097

medium for use in a network provider of a computer based communications system having a routing instruction processor, a parser, and an HTTP analysis layer, the parser connected between the routing instruction processor and the HTTP analysis layer, the schema including routing rules, which, when accessed to parse a document written in the language of the schema, provide routing actions to be taken on packets belonging to a traffic flow associated with the document, and routing the packets accordingly to application providers, wherein each application provider directly manages the routing rules.

8. (Original) The schema as defined in claim 7 wherein the routing rules are defined by an application provider.